

Appendix

CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE

§ 1524. [Grounds for issuance: From whom or where property may be taken.] A search warrant may be issued upon any of the following grounds:

1. When the property was stolen or embezzled.
2. When the property or things were used as the means of committing a felony.
3. When the property or things are in the possession of any person with the intent to use it as a means of committing a public offense, or in the possession of another to whom he may have delivered it for the purpose of concealing it or preventing its being discovered.
4. When the property or things to be seized consist of any item or constitutes any evidence which tends to show a felony has been committed, or tends to show that a particular person has committed a felony.

The property or things described in this section may be taken on the warrant from any place, or from any person in whose possession it may be. [Enacted 1872; Am. Stats. 1899, p. 87; Stats. 1957, ch. 1884, § 1.]

HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE

§ 17970. Entry and Inspection of Building or Premises. Any officer, employee, or agent of an enforcement agency may enter and inspect any build-

ing or premises whenever necessary to secure compliance with, or prevent a violation of, any provision of this part and rules and regulations promulgated thereunder which the enforcement agency has the power to enforce.

Added by Stats 1961 ch 1844 § 8.

§ 17972. Entering Dwellings Between 6 p.m. and 8 a.m.: Consent of Owner or Occupants: Court Order. No person authorized by this article to enter buildings shall enter ~~any~~ dwelling between the hours of 6 o'clock p.m. of any day and 8 o'clock a.m. of the succeeding day, without the consent of the owner or of the occupants of the dwelling, nor enter any dwelling in the absence of the occupants without a proper written order executed and issued by a court having jurisdiction to issue the order.

Added by Stats 1961 ch 1844 § 8.

§ 17983. Orders of Superior Court. The Superior Court may make any order for which application is made pursuant to this article.

Added by Stats 1961 ch 1844 § 8.

§ 19825. Code Provisions not Applicable Within City Having and Enforcing Ordinance Prescribing Minimum Standards Equal to or Greater Than Provisions of This Division: Construction of Chapter: When Provisions Effective in City. (a) The provisions of [1] *Part 1.5 (commencing with Section 17910)* of this division and of Chapter 1 (*commencing with Section 19000*), Chapter 2 (*commencing with Section*

19100), and Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 19300) of Part 3 of this division shall not apply within any city having and enforcing a local ordinance prescribing minimum standards equal to or greater than such provisions of this division; such local ordinance shall supersede such provisions of this division.

* * *

(c) The provisions of this chapter shall be effective only in a city where the legislative body determines that an ordinance described in subdivision (a) of this section is in force and effect and so notifies the state department presently charged with enforcement of the provision of this division if a state department be so charged. [Amended by Stats 1961 ch 1844 § 11.]

SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING CODE SECTIONS 801-806.A

Sec. 801. Enforcement. The Superintendent is the authorized representative of the Director in the enforcement of this Code. Whenever it shall be necessary, in the opinion of the Superintendent, to call upon the Police Department for aid or assistance in carrying out, or enforeing, any of the provisions of this Code, which it is his duty to enforce, he shall have the authority to do so, and it shall be the duty of the Chief of Police, or of any member of the Police Department, when called upon by the Superintendent, to act according to the instructions of, and to perform

such duties as may be required by, the Superintendent in order enforce or put into effect the provisions of this Code that it is his duty to enforce.

Sec. 802. Right to Enter Buildings. Authorized employees of City departments, so far as may be necessary for the performance of their duties, shall have the right to enter any new or unoccupied building or any building under construction, repair, alteration or removal, or any building thought in whole or in part to be illegal, unsafe, or a menace to life and limb, upon showing their badges of office.

Sec. 803. Stopping Construction. The Superintendent shall have the power to stop the grading, filling or excavating of land, or the construction, alteration or repairs of any structure when, in his opinion, such work is being done in a dangerous, reckless or careless manner, or in violation of any of the provisions of this Code and to order all work to be stopped. The work shall be stopped immediately and shall not be resumed without authorization from the Superintendent.

The Superintendent may disapprove any application for a building permit to alter or build upon a building which is an unsafe structure, as defined in Section 804.A., until a permit is first obtained to correct all unsafe features and the entire building is put in a safe condition.

Sec. 804. Unsafe Buildings. Unsafe buildings shall be determined and subject to Sections 804.A through 804.I. (*Amend. Ord. 179-62, app. 7-13-62*)

Sec. 804.A. General. All buildings, structures, or parts thereof, which are structurally unsafe or not provided with adequate egress, or which constitute a fire hazard, or are otherwise dangerous to human life, or which in relation to existing approved use constitute a hazard to safety by reason of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation, obsolescence or abandonment, or were erected, altered or moved without a permit, or are hereafter erected, altered, constructed or maintained in violation of this Code, are for the purpose of this section unsafe buildings. All such unsafe buildings are hereby declared to be public nuisances and shall be abated by the Director, as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 804.B. Complaints. The Superintendent shall examine, or cause to be examined, every building, or structure, or portion thereof coming within the provisions of the preceding subsection, and, if found to be an unsafe building, he shall file written complaint with the Director which shall contain specific allegations, setting forth the conditions complained of.

Sec. 804.C. Notice of Hearing. Upon the filing of such complaint the Director shall cause a copy thereof, together with a notice of the time and place set for the hearing thereof, to be served either personally or by registered or certified mail upon the owner of said building, or part thereof complained of, or his agent, and shall cause a copy of said complaint, together with the said notice of hearing, to be posted in some conspicuous place on said building. If the owner does not reside in San Francisco, and has no

agent in San Francisco, the time fixed for the hearing of said complaint shall be not less than forty-eight (48) hours after the service and posting of the copy of the complaint and notice. The time of hearing shall be extended one (1) day for each six hundred (600) miles the owner is distant from San Francisco, but in no event shall such extended time be more than five (5) days from the date of mailing. The notice shall require all persons interested to appear at the hearing to show cause, if any they have, why said structure, building or part thereof complained of, should not be declared unsafe and a public nuisance. (*Amend. Ord. 179-62, app. 7-13-62*)

Sec. 804.D. Hearing. The public hearing shall be held on the day and hour, and at the place designated in the notice of hearing, at which time the Director will consider the facts of the case.

Sec. 804.E. Decision. The Director, upon conclusion of said hearing, shall decide upon the facts submitted whether or not the building complained of constitutes a nuisance under this section and shall set forth his decision in a formal statement which shall include his findings and order of condemnation.

Sec. 804.F. Order.

1. **Order of vacation and demolition.** The Director upon his findings and determination that the building, or part thereof, complained of is a public nuisance shall order the demolition of or the vacation of the same for all purposes and uses, and shall cause a copy of said order to be posted in a conspicuous place on the

building, or part thereof, determined to be a nuisance, and a copy of said order shall be served either personally or by registered mail upon the owner or his agent. The order shall specify the time within which said building, or part thereof, declared to be a nuisance shall be vacated, which shall be not less than forty-eight (48) hours after the service on the owner or agent, if resident of San Francisco, and not less than seventy-two (72) hours if the owner, or his agent, are non-residents of San Francisco.

Exception: In the case of extreme and immediate danger to the structure, or to persons in or around such structure, the order may specify immediate vacation without the notice of, or the public hearing, as set forth in Section 804.D.

2. Order of restoration. The Director upon his findings and determination that the building, or a part thereof, may be repaired, altered or reconstructed to comply with all applicable laws may order the owner, or his agent, to secure within a stipulated time all necessary permits, and to perform the work, as set forth in the applications for such permits, within a definite period.

Sec. 804.G. Abatement. Unless within forty-eight (48) hours after the service of notice to vacate, as provided above, the owner or his agent of the building, or part thereof declared to be a nuisance, shall notify the Director in writing that he will make, or

cause to be made, such alterations or repairs as in the judgment of the Director shall be necessary for the purpose of making said building or part thereof safe, the Director shall proceed to abate said building or part thereof. The Director, upon receiving written notice of the intention to comply by the owner or his agent, may grant a reasonable time to make alterations or repairs to rehabilitate said building or part thereof. If the alterations, repairs or rehabilitation, as provided for herein and in Section 804.F, are not made and completed within the time allowed by the Director, said Director shall order the abatement of the building, or portion thereof declared to be a nuisance, and shall have the same demolished and destroyed. The Director's order of condemnation together with allegations shall be filed with the County Recorder.

Sec. 804.H. Lien for Costs. Upon the written application therefor by the Director, the Board of Supervisors shall allow and order paid out of such fund, as the said Board of Supervisors may lawfully specify, any sum of money which may be necessary for the enforcement of this section, and the Controller shall audit and the Treasurer shall pay such sum so allowed and ordered paid, and the amount so expended to abate such nuisance shall become a lien upon the property upon which said nuisance was abated and said lien shall have priority over all other liens except those for taxes, and the said sum of money may be recovered by San Francisco by an action against said property or the owner or owners thereof.

Sec. 804.I. Reoccupation. When the building, or part thereof, which was declared to be a nuisance, is certified by the owner or his agent to comply with the requirements of the Director as to rehabilitation, alteration or repair, the Director shall cause inspection to be made of such building or part thereof. If it is found that the building is no longer unsafe, the Director shall grant in writing permission to reoccupy the same.

Sec. 805. Penalty for Violation. Any person, the owner or his authorized agent, who violates, disobeys, omits, neglects, or refuses to comply with, or who resists or opposes the execution of any of the provisions of this Code, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500.00), or by imprisonment, not exceeding six (6) months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, unless otherwise provided in this Code, and shall be deemed guilty of a separate offense for every day such violation, disobedience, omission, neglect or refusal shall continue. Any person who shall do any work in violation of any of the provisions of this Code, and any person having charge of such work who shall permit it to be done, shall be liable to the penalty provided.

It shall be unlawful for any person to interfere with the posting of any notice provided for in this article, or to tear down or mutilate any such notice so posted by the Department of Public Works in or upon any building or premises.

See Section 317.J for penalties for mismanagement of boilers.

See Section 324.E for penalties relating to signs.

Sec. 806. Board of Examiners.

Sec. 806.A. Establishment. There is hereby created a Board of Examiners, consisting of five (5) members who are qualified by experience and training to pass upon matters pertaining to building design and construction. Its functions shall be:

1. To determine whether specific new materials, new methods and types of construction comply with the standards of safety established by this Code; and to recommend the approval or disapproval of such new materials, new methods and types of construction;
2. To determine whether variances from the requirements of this Code should be approved for specific cases where new materials, new methods and types of construction are not involved, and where the enforcement of compliance therewith would result in unreasonable hardship;

It is the intent of this section that new materials, new methods and types of construction, which do not comply with the standards of safety established by this Code, shall in no event be approved; but that the requirements of this Code, other than those involving such standards of safety, may be waived under the circumstances hereinafter set forth;

3. To determine reasonable interpretations of the provisions of this Code.

The term "Standards of Safety," as used in this section, shall mean the general degree of safety conforming to the provisions of this Code as required to safeguard life or limb, health and public welfare.

SAN FRANCISCO FIRE CODE SECTION 1.04

Sec. 1.04 Authority to Enter Premises

(a) The Chief of Department and the Chief, Division of Fire Prevention and Investigation, or any of their duly authorized representatives, may enter any building or premises, for the purpose of making any inspection, or investigation which, under the provisions of this code, he or they may deem necessary to be made.

(b) The above referred to right of entry shall be exercised only at reasonable hours, and entry shall be made to any dwelling only with the consent of the owner or tenant thereof, or with the written order of a competent court.

(c) The Chief of Department and the Chief, Division of Fire Prevention and Investigation, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have the authority to enter any building or premises at any time for the purpose of extinguishing or controlling any fire; performing any rescue operations; investigating the existence of suspected or reported fires, gas leaks, or other hazardous conditions.

(d) Any person who, at the scene of a fire or other emergency requiring the operations of the Fire Department, disobeys the lawful orders of the Chief of Department, or his duly authorized representative; or offers any resistance to, or interference with, the operations of the Fire Department at any fire or any other emergency; or engages in any activity calculated to prevent the extinguishment of any fire; or forbids, prevents or dissuades others from assisting to extinguish the same, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

SAN FRANCISCO HEALTH CODE SECTIONS 596-600

"Sec. 596. Insanitary Buildings, Etc. (a) Definition. All Buildings, structures, or parts thereof which are insanitary are hereby declared to be and are nuisances, and the Director of Public Health is hereby authorized and empowered to abate the same in the manner provided in Sections 596 to 600, inclusive, of this Article.

(b) Complaints. Whenever a written complaint shall be made to the Director of Public Health that any building, structure or part thereof is in an insanitary condition, the said Director shall order a hearing of said complaint and fix the time and place therefor. The complaint shall contain specific allegations setting forth the conditions complained of.

(c) Notice of Hearing. Upon the filing of such complaint, the Director of Public Health shall cause a copy thereof, together with a notice of the time and place set for the hearing thereof, to be served personally upon the owner of said structure, building or

part thereof complained of, or his agent, or the lessee, or the occupant thereof, and shall cause a copy of said complaint, together with said notice of hearing, to be posted in some conspicuous place on said structure. The time fixed for the hearing of said complaint shall not be less than forty-eight (48) hours after the service and posting of the copy of said complaint and said notice. Said notice shall require all persons interested to appear at the hearing to show cause, if any they have, why said structure, building or the part thereof complained of, should not be declared insanitary.

(d) Decision. The Director of Public Health, upon conclusion of said hearing, shall decide upon the facts submitted whether or not said alleged condition constitutes a nuisance under the terms of Sections 596 to 600, inclusive, of this Article and shall embody said decision in a formal statement setting forth his findings.

(e) Order of Vacation, Etc. The Director of Public Health, upon his determination and finding that the structure, building or part thereof complained of, is a nuisance, shall order the vacation of same for all purposes, and shall cause a copy of said order to be posted in a conspicuous place on the aforesaid structure, building or part thereof determined by said Director to be a nuisance, and a copy thereof to be personally served upon the owner thereof or his agent, or the lessee or the occupant thereof. The order shall specify the time within which said structure, building or part thereof determined by said Director

to be a nuisance shall be vacated, which shall not be less than forty-eight (48) hours after the passage of said order and the personal service thereof as above provided.

"Sec. 597. Notice to Police Department. The Director of Public Health shall give written notification thereof to the Chief of Police, who shall thereupon, through the officers of the Police Department, execute and enforce the said order of vacation.

"Sec. 598. Penalty for Resisting Order. Any owner, or the agent of such owner, or the lessee, or the occupant of any structure, building or part thereof ordered vacated hereunder who shall himself or through others forcibly resist or prevent the enforcement of such order shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than Twenty-Five (\$25.00) Dollars, nor more than Two Hundred and Fifty (\$250.00) Dollars, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not less than ten (10) days nor more than three (3) months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 599. Abatement. (a) Notice to Director. Unless within forty-eight (48) hours after the service of notice to vacate as above provided, the owner, or his agent, or the lessee, or the occupant of said building, structure or part thereof, shall notify the Director of Public Health in writing that he will make or cause to be made such alterations or repairs as in the judgment of the Director of Public Health shall be necessary for the purpose of making said

building, structure or part thereof sanitary, the Director of Public Health shall proceed to abate the same. If said notice be given as aforesaid the Director of Public Health shall grant a reasonable time to make said alterations and repairs. If said alterations and repairs are not made and completed within said time allowed by said Director, the Director of Public Health shall by formal statement, order, and in accordance with said order, cause the abatement of said nuisance and the destruction of said building, structure or part thereof, herein provided, found and determined to be a nuisance.

(b) Reoccupation. The structure, building or part thereof vacated hereunder shall not be reoccupied without the written permission of the Director of Public Health, but such permission must be granted when within the time allowed as hereinbefore specified the alterations and repairs required to be made by the Director of Public Health shall have been made.

(c) Lien for Costs. Upon the written application therefor of the Director of Public Health, the Board of Supervisors shall allow and order paid out of such fund as the Board of Supervisors may lawfully specify any sums the expenditure of which may be necessary for the enforcement of Sections 596 to 600, inclusive, of this Article, and the Controller shall audit and the Treasurer shall pay such sums so allowed and ordered paid, and the amount so expended shall become a lien upon the property upon which said nuisance was abated in accordance with the provisions of Sections 596 to 600, inclusive of this

Article. And said amount may be recovered by an action against said property or the owner thereof.

"Sec. 600. Penalty. Any person, firm or corporation, or their agents, violating any of the provisions of Sections 596 to 599, inclusive, of this Article, or failing to comply with any direction or order of the Director of Public Health given pursuant to the provisions of Sections 596 to 599, inclusive, of this Article, by the Director of Public Health or any other agent of said Director of Public Health, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than Twenty-Five (\$25.00) Dollars nor more than Two Hundred and Fifty (\$250.00) Dollars, or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not less than ten (10) days nor more than three (3) months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

**PORTIONS OF THE ANNUAL REPORT; THE SAN FRANCISCO
WORKABLE PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT
1966**

City and County of San Francisco, California

Form of Government:

Combined City and County—Mayor (Executive)

Board of Supervisors—(legislative)

Principal Sources of Employment: Diversified—services, government, manufacturing, retail trade, finance-insurance-real estate, transportation-utilities, wholesale trade

Population:

1950 Census	1960 Census	Current, Estimate
775,357	740,316	750,500 (July 1, 1965) (Calif. Dept. of Finance)

Housing—1960 Census:

Total No. of Housing Units	310,559
Total No. Substandard and Deficient Units	57,677
—Dilapidated Units	5,321
—Deteriorating Units	25,275
—Sound Units Lacking Some or all plumbing facilities	27,081*

This Program Submission was Approved by the Governing Body of the Community on: February 18, 1966

By Such Approval, the Governing Body Confirms its Obligation to use its Authority and Local Public and Private Resources in an Effective Plan of Action to Eliminate and Prevent Slums and Blight and to Submit an Annual Report of Progress to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Name and Title of the Official Responsible for Preparing This Submission and for Coordinating the Program:

John F. Shelley, Mayor
through *

John H. Anderson, Urban Renewal Coordinator

The following programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are Being Utilized in the Community.

Federal Housing Administration loan insurance—
section 220,221(d)(3), housing for elderly; Public

*As defined by U. S. Bureau of Census.

Housing Administration—loans and contributions for low-rent housing; Community Facilities Administration—college housing loans, housing for elderly loans; Urban Renewal Administration—project loans and grants, Community Renewal Program grant, housing demonstration grant; Planning grant for metropolitan area plan (to Association of Bay Area Governments); Federal National Mortgage Association mortgage commitments; Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program assistance; Office of the Administrator—mass transportation demonstration grant (to Bay Area Rapid Transit District); Open Space Land Program.

The Community Plans to Utilize the Following HHFA Programs:

Same as above, plus: FHA loan insurance, especially rehabilitation loans, rent supplements, and other programs of the 1965 Housing Act; Urban Renewal Administration—General Neighborhood Renewal Plan; Open Space Land Program, possible Urban Renewal Demonstration Grant, other provisions of the 1965 Housing Act; Community Facilities Administration—possible use of Public Works Planning Advances; Beautification Program grants; Office of the Administrator—Mass Transportation Capital Improvement Grants.

I—CODES AND ORDINANCES

Objective: The adoption of, and compliance with, adequate standards of health, sanitation, and safety under a comprehensive system of codes and ordinances which set the minimum conditions under which dwellings may lawfully be occupied.

A. Codes Essential to Community Improvement

Objectives:

Kind of Code Date Adopted

Building	May	1956	(major amendments made in August, 1964)
Plumbing	May	1955	
Electrical	March	1951	
Housing	July	1958	(minor amendments only)
Zoning	May	1960	(recent major amendments include height limits, and changes in standards of certain residential and commercial zones; sign control)
Fire	Feb.	1965	

San Francisco has not adopted "model codes" as such. These national standards are studied, and their provisions, or often more restrictive provisions, are adopted into codes designed to fit the San Francisco situation in regard to such characteristics as density, fire hazards, fire protection and earthquake dangers.

B. Goals for Adoption of Codes Set Forth in the Last Program Submission:

Since San Francisco has a full set of modern codes controlling building, housing, and related areas, there were no goals for the adoption of new codes in the last submission. Codes are being kept

up to date. Discussion of recent amendments and the amendment process follow in later sections.

C. Committees Established for Continuing Review of Codes:

In San Francisco, code formulation and amendments go through extensive review by industrial, professional and community service organizations as well as by all concerned departments of the City government as represented on the Code Enforcement Sub-committee of the Inter-Agency Committee on Urban Renewal.

The procedures established for code review have been detailed in previous submissions of the Workable Program for Urban Renewal. Since few proposed amendments to the Building and Housing Codes have been formulated during the past year, they have been referred to the committee members directly interested.

D. Schedule for the Periodic Review and Up-Dating of Codes:

Kind of Code	Code Under Review Since Last Submission		Schedule Date Next Review to Be Completed
	YES	NO	
Building	X		December 1967 ¹
Plumbing	X		July 1966 ²
Electrical	X		December 1967 ²
Housing	X		July 1966
Zoning (See Section II—Community Planning)			
Fire		X	

¹Mandatory review every three years.

²When amended, Plumbing and Electrical Codes will provide for mandatory review every three years after regular changes are made every three years in model codes.

E. Has the Community Met the Goals for Code Review Set Forth in its Last Submission?

Not complefely. (See below)

Progress Made: Although 60% of the first draft of the Plumbing Code has been completed, completion of the review and revision of this Code has been delayed because of the diversion of staff time to the review of the Electrical Code which is in greater need of revision. An Electrical Code Committee has been formed to write a single code combining portions of the National Electrical Code, State of California Safety Orders, and requirements desired by this Bureau. The members of this committee are representatives of utility companies, unions, contractors, professional engineers and architects, electrical equipment manufacturers, and City staff. The committee is served by a professional engineering consultant who is drafting the code. The combining of Federal, State and local codes has been accomplished by only one or two cities in the country. The process is long and tedious. The reviewing committee, meeting an average of four hours each week, does not expect to complete the writing of the code until late 1967.

F. Codes in Effect; Personnel Involved:

Kind of Code	Department Responsible For Administration & Enforcement	No. of Personnel (No. of Field Inspectors are listed in (parenthesis))	1964-65		1965-66	
			1964-65	1965-66	1964-65	1965-66
Zoning	Dept. of City Planning Zoning Division	17 (1)	17	(1)		
Building	Dept. of Pub. Works, Bur. of Building Inspection	45 (30)	45	(30)		
Plumbing	Dept. of Pub. Works, Bur. of Building Inspection	12 (9)	12	(9)		
Electrical	Dept. of Pub. Works, Bur. of Building Inspection	21 (18)	21	(18)		
Housing (Report of Record) (Planned Area)	Dept. of Public Works, Bur. of Building Inspection	4 (0)	4	(0)		
(Complaint)	Dept. of Pub. Works, Bur. of Building Inspection	11 (9)	11	(9)		
(Annual & Complaint)	Dept. of Pub. Health, Bur. of Sanitation & Housing Insp.	74 (50)	74	(50)		
(Housing & Fire Codes)	Fire Dept. Div. of Fire Prevention & Investigation	32 (20)	32	(20)		

Notes: *Field Inspectors (listed in parentheses) include only those personnel who spend more than 25% of their time in the field. In a few cases this includes immediate supervisors of the Inspectors.

In the Bureau of Sanitation and Housing Inspection, one Inspector spends 100% and one spends 80% of his time; 45 Inspectors spend 39% of their time on Housing Code work for the Bureau; 3 spend 100% on Housing Code work for the Urban Renewal Division; Bureau of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works. The remaining personnel includes 7 Inspectors who spend no time in Housing Code work; 9 supervisory and 8 clerical personnel, each spending 20% of his time on Housing Code Work.

G. Code Administration

Changes in Comprehensive Program:

The City-sponsored Conservation Program is being carried out on a building-by-building basis in ten areas designated by the Chief Administrative Officer on the recommendation of the Director of City Planning. Procedures have been explained in previous Workable Programs. As reported in previous Workable Programs, public meetings to explain the conservation program were held in the Glen Park, Great Highway and Visitacion Valley districts. In May 1965 Buena Vista Heights was designated a Conservation Area. A public meeting attended by over 200 people was sponsored by neighborhood organizations.

	<u>Date Designated</u>	<u>Total Buildings Estimated</u>	<u>Buildings Inspected</u>	<u>Violations Detected</u>	<u>Buildings Brought Into Compliance</u>
Pacific Heights (Areas 1 thru 5)	Nov. 1959 through Apr. 1961	1852	1801	1514	1109
Visitacion Valley	Oct. 1960	2140	1938	1223	1145
Glen Park	Nov. 1962	1214	349	269	190
West Nob Hill	Nov. 1962	949	459	405	253
Great Highway	Nov. 1962	1255	185	131	96
Buena Vista Heights	May 1965	416	24	21	0
Total Buildings		7826	4756	3563	2793
Total Dwelling Units		19,518	17,092	13,133	7942

Alteration permits issued in these areas during the past year averaged \$148,275 a month for a total of \$1,779,300. It is estimated that 55% of the \$6,305,841 worth of permit work in all areas was above Code requirements.

In West Nob Hill, alteration permits issued since the program began there 33 months ago average \$40,800 per month which is four times the average value in the five years preceding designation of the area.

Conservation Area One (Pacific Heights) was de-designated by the Chief Administrative Officer on July 1, 1964 after 4½ years during which time approximately \$500,000 was spent by the property owners to improve the properties within the area. Only 45% of this amount was required to comply with Codes, averaging \$160 per dwelling unit. The appearance of the area was improved by the removal of overhead wires and the planting of trees along Sacramento Street. Similar improvements were made in the other conservation areas. Conservation Area Two was de-designated on March 1, 1965, and Conservation Area Three was de-designated on July 1, 1965.

Other code enforcement programs are discussed in Section H.2, following.

Plans for improving Comprehensive Program:
An application is nearing completion for submission to the Board of Supervisors requesting a grant to carry out a federally assisted conservation program to augment the City's present program.

Moves toward consolidation of code enforcement activities were made in several directions. By mutual agreement of all agencies concerned, the Health Department no longer checks applications for new buildings. Also, by mutual agreement, the Dept. of City Planning no longer checks permits for alteration work unless a question of zoning is involved. This latter arrangement has reduced by approximately 50% the number of alteration permits processed through the Department of City Planning. Within each of the reviewing agencies procedures have been initiated which further reduce the amount of time required to process applications. These and other moves toward consolidation resulted from the concerted efforts of City departments and civic and professional groups to effect a physical and administrative consolidation of code enforcement activities. A program for consolidation was presented to the Board of Supervisors by the Chief Administrative Officer in 1965. Action by the Board was delayed because of the fear expressed by members of building trades unions, builders, architects, and others, that consolidation would create more red tape and delay. Also the City Fire Department opposed a proposed Charter amendment redefining the powers and duties of the Fire Department vis-a-vis code enforcement, which was recommended by the Chief Administrative Officer as necessary for the proposed consolidation.

The Chief Administrative Officer, or his representative, is meeting regularly via the Chamber of Commerce with the opposing groups to see if an acceptable plan for consolidation can be worked out. Many of the points of disagreement have been discussed and some have been resolved. It is anticipated now that the proposal for consolidation can be resubmitted to the Board of Supervisors before November, 1966, and favorable action is anticipated.

H. Data on Code Enforcement Activity: July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1965

	Bldg. Code	Plmbg. Code	Elec. Code	DPW Urban Renewal	Housing Code		Total
					DPW Compl.	DPH Annual	
Permits Issued	13507	20728	15768	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inspection Trips	50844	30030	44693	15591	2447	50014	68052
Buildings Inspected	NR	NR	NR	524	173	16053	15760
Violation Notices Issued	2578	982	4006	400	151	391	942
Violation Notices Satisfied	2578	822	3990	806	143	615	1564
Violations Being Corrected	NA	878	NR	781 ^b	192 ^b	1343 ^b	2316 ^b
Stop Orders Issued*	NR	NA	NR	NR	NR	23	23
Certificates of Completion	NR	NR	NR	NA	NA	NA	NA

Notes: NA means Not Applicable.

NR means Not Recorded.

*Housing Code data includes only Condemnation or Abatement Orders of the Department Directors.

^aEstimate of number of application for permits to correct violations.

H.3 HOUSING CODE ENFORCEMENTS

	DPW No. of Structures				No. of Dwelling Units		
	DPW Conser- vation	DPW Com- plaint	DPH Annual	Total	DPW Conser- vation	DPH Com- plaint	Total
Inspected during past 12 mos.	524	151	16053	16728	1910	768	160530*
Found in noncompliance with Housing Code during past 12 mos.	400	149	391	940	1640	483	3910*
Noncompliance carryover from prior inspections	1382	414	2865	4661	5828	1244*	28650*
Total requiring compliance action	1782	563	3256	5601	7468	1727	32560
Brought into compliance during past 12 mos.	773	148	595	1506	2792	425	4301
Razed or otherwise eliminated during past 12 mos.	33	86	20	139	195*	312	876
Total compliance action completed	806	234	615	1655	2987	737	5177
Remaining in noncompliance at end of past 12 mos.	976	329	2641	3946	4481	990*	27383
Estimated number to be brought into compliance during coming year	1000	300	600	1900	2500	1000	6000
Notes: *Estimate							9500

*Includes rooming units and a few vacant units

*The rate of inspections during the coming year may be slowed down for a few weeks during the training period needed to effectuate departmental consolidation

H.4 HOUSING CODE APPEALS:

Number filed with Appeals Board	63
Number resolved by Appeals Board	113*
Number filed with Courts	148
Number resolved by the Courts	95

The governing body, the Board of Supervisors, does not have review power of individual cases under the Housing Code.

*Number pending

VII—CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Objective: Community-wide participation on the part of individuals and representative citizens' organizations which will provide, both in the community generally and in selected areas, the understanding and support necessary to accomplish community goals.

A. Name and Title of the Official Responsible for Assuring Citizen Participation in All Workable Program Activities.

The Mayor, through his Urban Renewal Coordinator, is responsible for citizen participation. The San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association (SPUR) is the citizen group officially responsible for the involvement of citizen participation in the Workable Program for Community Improvement, and is charged with advising on planning, housing and development matters after objective citizen investigation. The Human Rights Commission has been directed by the Mayor to serve as a special committee on minority housing problems and to advise on the subject of equal opportunity in housing and matters related thereto.

B. Advisory Committee Meetings Held During the Past Year:

SPUR is a private, non-profit, non-partisan corporation. Its Executive Board meets at least once a month. Numerous study committees meet continually throughout the year, with at least two committees meeting each week. A special 80-man

citizens' advisory committee was formed to follow the development of the Community Renewal Program, and met at least six times during the year. The Human Rights Commission, an official government agency, meets regularly as a full commission at least twice a month, and has numerous public hearings.

C. Changes in Membership of Citizens Advisory Committee Since the Last Submission:

SPUR's membership is open to anyone in the city or region. This year's membership has increased to 868, compared with 713 last year, and approximately 250 in 1959. New Board members include neighborhood and minority leaders. At least four neighborhood associations joined as organization members. The membership of the Human Rights Commission is described in Section H-1 and in the supplementary material list. The members of the citizens' advisory committee of the Human Rights Commission is also included in the supplementary material (Annual Report, HRC).

D: Specific Activities Undertaken by the Citizens Advisory Committee During the Past Year:

As an on-going organization, SPUR has continued its usual program of scheduling weekly and monthly meetings for study committees, ad hoc working committees, and for general membership. In addition to the Newsletter, which features special issues, SPUR publishes a monthly bulletin to keep members informed of

day to day activities, special reports on current issues and independent reports by committees. Because of the passage of Proposition 14 in November, 1964, which nullified fair housing laws in California, there was less than usual emphasis on redevelopment during the past year; however, SPUR kept in close touch with the Redevelopment Agency's on-going programs. Some of SPUR's more specific activities are listed as follows:

- * SPUR formed a joint Regional Planning and Housing Committee to investigate the regional implications of housing.
- * SPUR worked intensively over a period of a year with the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council to encourage the undertaking of "grass roots" neighborhood plan. SPUR worked out arrangements with the University of California Medical Center to contribute funds in the amount of \$15,000, with matching funds by SPUR, to undertake such a plan. Unfortunately, the offer was rejected for lack of support by the neighborhood.
- * SPUR worked with the Arguello Park Community to complete the Arguello Neighborhood Park, the first of its kind, in the city. It was built by the citizens themselves with private contributions.
- * SPUR worked with the Upper Market Planning Association to encourage the undertaking

of a "grass roots" neighborhood plan. The board of directors of the Association has been formed of representatives from the entire area and includes at least five residents of local improvement associations. With the assistance of the San Francisco Foundation; SPUR gave a grant to the Upper Market Planning Association in the amount of \$8,000 to begin a neighborhood improvement plan. The Association chose a planning consultant and the work is underway.

- * SPUR continued to urge the Mayor to make an appointment of a high-level coordinator of housing, planning and development in line with its recommendation of 1963, which was further amplified by the Community Renewal Program report. The Mayor sought the advice of SPUR regarding specific candidates for the appointment.
- * SPUR played a major role in the formation of the Bay Development and Conservation Commission, a State agency for control and regulation of bay fill. Two SPUR members were appointed to the Commission and SPUR's associate director was chosen as director of the Commission.
- * The executive director of SPUR has been asked to serve on numerous citizen advisory committees in San Francisco and throughout the Bay Area regarding housing and trans-

portation, such as the Bay Area Transportation Study, the Community Renewal Program, the Market Street Task Force, etc.

- * SPUR continued to play an active role in the Market Street Planning Project.
- * SPUR issued a number of specific reports on the city's transportation problems, urging the formation of a special transportation commission, authority or department.
- * SPUR held a successful workshop on the planning of spectator sports facilities.
- * SPUR proposed a South-of-Market campus for the University of California.

E. Specific Program Activities of the Citizens Advisory Committee to be Undertaken During the Coming Year.

In accordance with its policy of follow-through, most of the activities listed above will be continued during 1966. SPUR will give careful consideration to reorganization that would continue to give greater emphasis to neighborhood improvement work.

SPUR will make a careful analysis of the final report on the Community Renewal Program and will continue to review city actions as they relate to the Community Renewal Program recommendations.

SPUR is giving increased emphasis to the problem of low-cost housing now that the Public

Housing Authority's development program is underway and, particularly because of the new tools made available in the 1965 Housing Act. In the early part of 1966, SPUR anticipates holding a high-level workshop on housing.

SPUR will give consideration to a workshop on the relationship of city planning to school planning.

It is SPUR's intention to sponsor a special "San Francisco Week", giving attention to the important areas of city planning and development, in an effort to bring city-wide interest to city planning.

- F. Subcommittees of the Citizens Advisory Committee Established to Work on Special Problems Such as Equal Opportunity for Housing, Neighborhood Participation, Code Compliance, Relocation Housing, Public Information, Capital Improvement Program, etc.

Minority Housing: As mentioned in item B, the Human Rights Commission was formed and officially assigned the responsibility of advising on the problems of equal opportunity for housing and minority problems in relocation housing. (See H.1.)

Spur Committees:

Executive Committee: A 20-man executive committee, which meets at least once a month, is the action committee of SPUR. This committee

handles all administrative and policy matters as recommended or referred to it by standing study committees or ad hoc committees. SPUR has four study committees with memberships running from 150 to 250 each. These committees, which meet once each month, are City Planning, Housing, Transportation and Regional Planning. Notices of these committee meetings are sent to the entire membership with an approximate attendance between 35 and 50 persons regularly. These meetings are also open to the public and most often include public officials from the City and County of San Francisco.

Special Committees: SPUR organizes ad hoc or work committees. In the past these have included Governmental Organization, Planning Department, Budget, Low Cost Housing, Regional Transportation, Code Enforcement and Organization, Board of Permit Appeals, South-of-Market Redevelopment, Capital Improvement Program, and others.

Codes: The Chamber of Commerce has a Code Committee which meets regularly to review code changes. A code advisor from SPUR is a member of this committee.

G. Staff Assistance for Citizens Committee:

SPUR staff consists of the executive director and an assistant director, with three clerical positions. SPUR was not able to add a full time neighbor-

hood worker to the staff during the past year but hopes to do so in 1966.

H.1. Membership of the Subcommittee of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Minority Group Housing. In January, 1965, Mayor Shelley assigned the Human Rights Commission the role of advisor to the City government on matters of equal opportunity in housing and urban development.

The Human Rights Commission was established by ordinance on July 13, 1964. The following excerpt from that ordinance is the declaration of policy for the Human Rights Commission:

It is hereby declared that the policy of the City and County of San Francisco is to act to give effect to the rights of every inhabitant of the City and County to equal economic, political and educational opportunity, to equal accommodations in all business establishments in the City and County and to equal service and protection by public agencies; that an instrumentality should be established to give effect to such rights, to eliminate prejudice and discrimination because of race, religion, color, ancestry or place of birth, to inform the inhabitants of the City and County of developments in human relations, to provide expert advice and assistance to the officers, agencies, boards, departments and employees of the City and County in undertaking ameliorative practices to keep peace and good order and to officially

encourage private persons and groups to promote and provide equal opportunity for and good will toward all people.

The Human Rights Commission has a membership of 15 which is representative of diverse race, color, religion and ancestry. The Commission is assisted by an Advisory Council of 40 members, 2 public relations consultants, and a staff of 4, including a Director, a Community Organization Representative, a Human Relations Analyst, and an Employment Representative. A Housing Specialist will be employed in 1966.

A complete listing of the membership of the Human Rights Commission and the major activities of the Commission to date are continued in the supplementary material. (First Annual Report of the Human Rights Commission, September 1965.)

I. Citizen Participation Programs Carried Out or Planned for Neighborhoods or Areas to be Directly Affected by Clearance, Systematic Code Compliance, Conservation, etc.

When areas of neighborhoods are scheduled for code enforcement programs, SPUR confers with the head of the Urban Renewal Division of the Department of Public Works, prior to the designation of such area. The executive director of SPUR joins city officials in making presentations before neighborhood groups to explain plans and proposals and citizen rights in neighborhood code

enforcement programs. SPUR offers its assistance to any neighborhood which is contemplating renewal or code treatment of any kind, to devise its own plans and programs or to analyze those which are being prepared for its neighborhood by the City. SPUR offers both its staff and citizen members to act as go-betweens and third party members of any meetings or deliberations between the neighborhood and the City.

The Economic Opportunity Council:

The Economic Opportunity Council was appointed by Mayor Shelley in September, 1964, to formulate a community action program under Public Law 88-542.

Initially, four "pockets of poverty" were identified in which more than one-third of the families were earning less than \$4,000 per year: Western Addition, Hunters Point, Chinatown and Inner Mission. Through recent studies, four additional areas have been considered for inclusion in the program.

Two of the target areas are within urban renewal areas: (1) the Western Addition where construction in the Western Addition Area 1 is nearing completion and where plans for development of another 72 blocks designated as Western Addition Area 2 have been completed and approved, but execution is delayed as a result of the passage of Proposition 14; (2) Hunters Point where the Redevelopment Agency had been asked by the

Board of Supervisors to make a study which would lead to a plan for development of the area now occupied by residents of temporary war housing which was scheduled to be demolished by 1970.

STATISTICS: HOME FIRE SAFETY PROGRAM

<u>Inspections</u>	<u>1963-1964</u>	<u>1964-1965</u>	<u>1965-1966</u>
Total homes contacted	39,701	25,581	33,167
Total homes admitted	16,448	10,120	13,036
Total "not home"	20,365	13,541	17,695
Total "declined"	2,888	1,920	2,436

Common Hazards Detected

Smoking—matches	209	163	113
Electricity	1,567	926	1,014
Flammable liquids	651	378	444
Stoves—heating	483	281	294
Rubbish—storage	2,951	1,745	2,226
Miscellaneous	984	599	848

